

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 8-12, and 18-20 are pending in this application. Claim 12 was objected to for an informality. Claims 1, 2, 8-12, and 18-20 were provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5-12, and 15-20 of co-pending U.S. application serial no. 11/235,263. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-12, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,956,337 to Kemper in view of U.S. patent 6,963,175 to Archenhold et al. (herein "Archenhold").

Addressing first the objection to claim 12, claim 12 is amended as suggested in the Office Action to address the objection thereto.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8-12, and 18-20 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 2, 5-12, and 15-20 of co-pending U.S. application serial no. 11/235,263, that rejection is obviated by the present response. Specifically, filed with the present response is a Terminal Disclaimer over co-pending U.S. application serial no. 11/235,263. The submission of that Terminal Disclaimer is believed to address that rejection.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 10-12, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kemper in view of Archenhold, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Applicant notes the outstanding rejection did not reject claim 9, and thus claim 9 is maintained as currently written. Claim 1 is canceled without prejudice and each of claims 2, 8, and 10 is amended by the present response to now depend from independent claim 9. Thus, independent claim 9, and claims 2, 8, and 10 dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

Applicant also notes previously pending dependent claim 19 was not rejected over Kemper in view of Archenhold. Thereby in response to that position, claim 19 is amended by the present response to include limitations from independent claim 11, although without reciting the "means for sensing a temperature" as that limitation is not believed necessary to place amended claim 19 in condition for allowance.

By the present amendment claim 19, now amended to be in independent form, is believed to distinguish over Kemper in view of Archenhold. Further, each of claims 11, 12, 18, and 20 is amended to now depend from amended independent claim 19. Thus, amended independent claim 19, and claims 11, 12, 18, and 20 dependent therefrom, are also believed to be allowable.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Charles L. Gholz  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 26,395

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
SNS/rac

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\24's\245233\245233US-AM1.DOC